DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 400 JC 940 151

AUTHOR Gallagher, Edward A.
TITLE Jordan and Lange: The California Junior College as Protector of Teaching. Working Papers in Education ED-94-1.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace.
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 22p.; Hanna Collection on the Role of Education. For a related document, see JC 940 152.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; Educational Theories; *Foundations of Education; Social Mobility; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California; Jordan (David S); Lange (Alexis F)

ABSTRACT

A group of contemporary historians has recently accused community and junior colleges of not offering the American masses new opportunities of upward social mobility, but instead of serving to divert them away from four-year colleges and universities. In particular, historians have taken issue with the efforts of David Jordan, of Stanford University, and Alexis Lange, of the University of California, who allegedly were skeptical of the intellectual capabilities of the masses and advocated the establishment of public junior colleges to free the universities to pursue higher tasks of research and advanced professional training. While revisionist historians have performed a service in challenging the overly idealized accounts of the origin and early development of junior colleges in California, their interpretations are rife with distortions. No revisionist, thus far, appears to have used vital primary sources such as the Jordan Papers, the Lange Papers, all of Jordan and Lange's published writings, Merton Hill's unpublished essay on California's early junior college movement, and all relevant California state government reports. A thorough review of these works illustrates that, rather than being academic elitists, Jordan and Lange were concerned about the newly emerging American universities' emphasis on research at the expense of teaching, and hence favored linking junior colleges to teaching-oriented high schools instead of research-oriented universities. Because high schools might emphasize teaching at the expense of scholarship, Lange and Jordan felt that the junior college might evolve as a hybrid institution with some of the university's concern for scholarship and some of high school's emphasis on effective teaching. (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 400

JORDAN AND LANGE: THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE AS PROTECTOR OF TEACHING

by

EDWARD A. GALLAGHER

Working Papers in Education
ED-94-1

THE HOOVER INSTITUTION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MARCH 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. A. Gallagher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 940 151

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JORDAN AND LANGE: THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE AS PROTECTOR OF TEACHING

by

EDWARD A. GALLAGHER

Working Papers in Education
ED-94-1

THE HOOVER INSTITUTION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MARCH 1994

The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Overseers of the Hoover Institution.

JORDAN AND LANGE: THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE AS PROTECTOR OF TEACHING

Edward A. Gallagher
Oakland Comunity College
2900 Featherstone Road
Auburn Hill, MI 48326

A new group of educational historians has in recent years accused community junior colleges of having the implicit function not of offering the American masses new opportunities of upward social mobility but the purpose of diverting them away from four-year colleges and universities. One writer states that "throughout its history" the community junior college "has served a very conservative role, one that unquestioningly accepts an elitist, structured, industrial society as a positive goal and that views the aspirations of the common man as unrealistic and inappropriate."[1] Another writer even found a "conspiracy" among California junior college leaders, especially with David Starr Jordan at Stanford and Alexis F. Lange at the University of California, who allegedly advocated the establishment of public junior colleges primarily as "a means of diverting students away from the university into an upward extension of the high school. Thus protected from those clamoring for access, the university would be free to pursue its higher tasks of research and advanced professional training."[2]

The most controversial critic of the public junior college has argued that its "theoretical fathers were not concerned with what came to be called junior colleges, quite the contrary; they were concerned about the university - the real university." According to this "revisionist" historian and others, Jordan and Lange were "skeptical of the intellectual capabilities of the masses" and Lange, in particular, "traveled up and down the length of California admonishing junior-college administrators to prevent the wrong students from attempting to prepare for transfer to the elite universities where such training would be harmful to them - considering their intellectual limitations." The fact that relatively few students might be admitted to Stanford and the University of California was from their perspective evidence that junior colleges were successful in their

---

1

2

primary function of sorting students. [3]

While the revisionists have performed a service in challenging the earlier over-idealized accounts on the origin and early development of junior colleges in California, they have been guilty of distortions in their interpretations. No revisionist, thus far, appears to have used the vital primary sources such as the Jordan Papers, the Lange Papers, all of Jordan and Lange's published writings, Merton Hill's unpublished essay on the early junior college movement in California, all relevant California State Government Reports, and sources on specific junior colleges located in local public libraries. Even the best of the revisionist works, The Diverted Dream, reveals failure to use vital primary sources. If revisionist historians would cease quoting and citing from each others works and instead did a thorough job of historical research, their conclusions might be more accurate. Early junior college leaders in California were more anti-elitist than elitist and their writing and actions revealed this. Both Jordan and Lange were concerned about the newly emerging American universities emphasis on research at the expense of teaching, and favored grades thirteen and fourteen being related to the high schools partly because they believed the teaching would be better in the junior college than in those research-oriented universities. The California junior college would be the protector of the teaching function and might have a role distinct from both the university above and the high school below.

Jordan and Protecting the Teaching Function

In a speech during the first week of April 1990, Stanford University President Donald Kennedy stated "that Stanford and other leading universities needed to get rid of the "publish or perish" mentality and reaffirm that teaching is the primary task of higher educational institutions. He noted that too many courses were being taught by temporary and inexperienced faculty

---

3

members - especially by young graduate students. He lamented the absence of discussion about the teaching - learning process. Kennedy added that Stanford faculty "need to talk about teaching more, respect and reward those who do it well, and make its first among our labors. [4]

David Starr Jordan, Stanford's first president, anticipated the de-emphasis of the teaching function in American research universities as early as 1903. The growing tendency to make university faculty members "publish or perish" was partly conditioned by the corporate society emerging at the turn of the century. Universities with high research production records enjoyed enormous prestige in the academic world. Monographs written by a faculty promoted good academic public relations. Publishing provided a new and clear system of academic accounting in measuring the achievement of both persons and universities. Promotion at the research universities might be as easily determined as at the Standard Oil company. Instructors of undergraduate students knew that their advancement depended more upon research than good teaching. They therefore concentrated on writing, at the frequent expense of the students.[5] As Jordan summed up the situation, each "young instructor has been urged to place as many printed pages as possible to his credit, and in doing so has been encouraged to look with scorn on the "mere teacher" who cares for the intellectual welfare of the students without making himself "Known in Germany."[6] The result was that: "There is no worse teaching done under the sun than in the lower classes of some of our most famous colleges. Cheap tutors, unpracticed and unpaid boys are set to lecture to classes far beyond their power to interest. We are saving our money for original research, careless of the fact that we fail to give the elementary training which makes research possible."[7]

4

5

6

7

While recognizing the value of university research, Jordan showed a distrust of young "doctors of philosophy" who revealed "too much" enthusiasm for research and little interest in teaching. Reduced teaching loads might encourage some faculty members to become "indolent" as their research outputs declined over the years. He was especially upset by faculty members who looked forward to a time when they would scarcely have to teach at all. In spite of the Stanford president's attitude, research was gaining the upper hand over teaching and by 1910 it was nearly dominant.

But freshmen and sophomore students needed good teachers, especially "spark-starters" who knew how to stimulate students interest in intellectual matters. An effective instructor at that level must not only be "student oriented," but also able to evaluate and interpret life to students. Young graduate students rarely would be able to perform that essential function. Jordan sensed that a university should not permit most of its freshmen to be taught by inexperienced graduate students who in age and knowledge were superior to them by only a small margin.

Lower division instruction, according to Jordan, could be better provided at liberal arts colleges and extended high schools. He advocated the establishment of junior colleges, or extended high schools, in California as early as 1907. The Stanford president suggested to the trustees that the university might drop its lower division work when there were enough extended high schools in California providing it. He proposed that the equivalent of the requirements for the degree of "Associate in Arts," as granted by the University of Chicago, be required for admission to Stanford.[8]

To elevate Stanford University in accordance with his plans, Jordan developed a personal interest in the establishment of junior colleges throughout California. He spoke to college presidents, professors, and influential laymen throughout the state about the desirability of such

---

8

institutions. He considered the junior college to be the most important link in the evolution of a highly developed California educational system.[9]

Jordan, contrary to revisionist writings, was not a great admirer of European universities. He thought German universities were too elitist and consequently were unfit models for American institutions in a democratic society. American public and private universities would find their appropriate places at the summits of evolving state educational systems. He favored American universities like those at Palo Alto and Berkeley because "they...are never complete, but always look forward to something better. This gives a perennial impulse toward progress. The German university, on the contrary, is from the first a perfect representative of its type, with practically no hope of betterment..."[10]

Jordan was not impressed with English universities either because they neglected instruction in science and technology. Jordan, a trained scientist himself, was very disappointed with what he observed at Oxford. "...I once went through the colleges at Oxford to see how their science work compared with ours. I found but one college that had any laboratory whatever for undergraduates and that one had less equipment than the high school at Palo Alto at the time. That was in 1905."

Stanford University in its early years was not the "elitist" research university which exists today. It was under Jordan quite "radical" in its adherence to the admissions policy of the equality of subjects. From the beginning, it had a policy of free election and only English was required in succeeding years. In 1891 a student could choose any ten subjects, out of a list of twenty-five, in preparing for admission to Stanford. While the credits required were increased to fifteen by 1901, the list of acceptable credits was increased to thirty-two. Stanford even accepted industrial subjects such as woodshop, forge-work, foundry-work, and machine-shop to help fulfill admission

---

9

10

requirements to the Bachelor of Arts program.

In later years, as students were transferring to Stanford from California junior colleges, Jordan was quick to detect the adequacy of their preparation. He noted that "we do not find that the students from these schools are at all inferior to those who have been brought up thus far in the university." On one occasion, Jordan even noted that some junior college students were being admitted to Phi Beta Kappa. "I notice, in looking over the candidates for the Phi Beta Kappa that the number from junior colleges is even greater in proportion than from our own undergraduate classes. Every junior college will have some superior students and they will largely come to Stanford..."

Jordan believed that Stanford would become a first-rate university as its undergraduate students coming both from high schools and junior colleges would be well-prepared for advanced work. He acknowledged that "the value of junior college depends mainly on the character of the teachers which can be employed" and he repeatedly reminded educators and lay persons that students might be better taught in junior colleges than by inexperienced graduate student in research universities. Jordan stated:

..."In their eagerness to develop advanced work some institutions have relegated the college function almost solely to tutors without experience, and have left it without standards and without serious purpose. It is not right that even freshmen should be poorly taught. On the soundness of the college training everything else must depend. In the long run, the greatest university will be the one that devotes the most care to its undergraduates."

This message on the importance of undergraduate teaching by Stanford's first president stimulated an interest among educators and citizens in California to support the establishment of upward extended high schools or junior colleges. These institutions would be expected to provide most of the teaching of college freshmen and sophomores in the state.

Alexis Lange went beyond Jordon in dedication to the protection of the teaching function for grades thirteen and fourteen. He devoted a part of his professional career at Berkeley to establishing a center for the preparation of junior colleges administrators and teachers. Contrary to the revisionist view that Lange was "elitist" he insisted that schools needed to maintain a close relationship with the people. As director and later dean of the University School of Education, his influence on secondary education was felt throughout the state. He believed a state school system should be under lay control, but have the leadership, guidance and wisdom of professionally educated experts. Lange attempted to make Berkeley into a major center of influence in promoting American education reform. In a report to President Wheeler he stated that: "Since I took charge of the department I have steadily kept before me the purpose to assist in developing a school of education, a school that should stand in much the same relation to the Pacific Coast and the whole country as do the Columbia Teachers College and the Chicago School of Education to the whole country and their geographical areas of influence."

Lang was interested in the whole field of secondary education, continually speaking, teaching and writing on the need to establish a comprehensive secondary school system containing grades seven through fourteen. He was America's leading advocate and philosopher of both the junior high school and junior college. It was no coincidence that Berkeley had the nation's first junior high school and Fresno one of the earliest public junior colleges. Lange had a hand in the establishment of both institutions. He believed that secondary schools should develop their own set of purposes rather than just serving as preparatory schools for the emerging universities.[11]

Lange's concern for improving secondary education in California and later elsewhere was partly, inspired during his student years at the University of Michigan. He attained with distinction both the baccalaureate degree and the degree of Master of Arts, specializing in German, English

---

11

and Anglo-Saxon. After returning from the University of Berlin, he taught both English and German at Ann Arbor before joining the faculty at the University of California.

Lange's experience on campus in Ann Arbor both as student and instructor helped mold his thoughts about education. Michigan had established a chair of pedagogy in 1879 and W. H. Payne had been appointed professor of the Science and Art of Teaching. Lange had studied under Payne and later became an active member of the Herbartian Society. The Herbartians believed that effective education needed to be based on principles of psychology and their textbooks were used in most normal schools and in some university courses.[12] In 1895 the Herbartians inaugurated the Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching with Charles DeGarmo, the first President.

In 1901 Lange and DeGarmo published a book of Johann Frederick Herbart's writing entitled Outlines of Educational Doctrine.[13] As a professor of English, Lange studied and wrote papers on Education.

The Junior College as Promoter of Teaching

Lange had argued during the 1890's that secondary education included the first two years in the traditional American college. This view was based on his knowledge of German education and his experience under the "university system" at the University of Michigan. But, as early as 1907, he was also defining secondary education as covering grades seven through fourteen because of adolescent growth and development. The junior college years were a part of secondary education because of research in psychology. On October 24, 1907 he declared before the Northern California Teachers Association: "We may not all agree that the end of the fourteenth grade, when the majority of students have reached the age of 20, is psychologically a more natural boundary line for secondary education than either graduation from the high school at 18 or from

---

12

13

college at 22 or 23. I believe it is ."[14]

In 1912 Lange was chairman of a committee on Readjustment of Course of Study and the Certification of Teachers, for the California Teachers Association. The report of the committee was largely a vehicle for the dissemination of his ideas on adolescent development and the need to organize California education according to human growth. The report selected "the end of the sixth grade and the end of the fourteenth grade as points of articulation" for secondary education, with the primary school period below and the university period above, for, "on psychological grounds, such a regrouping is better adapted to the stages of development from childhood to manhood and womanhood."[15]

Lange thought that physiological development ought to influence the goals of secondary education, as well as the conditions of learning. He maintained that each stage in the education of a child is unique because of physiological growth, interests, and psychological needs. Educators needed to caution themselves against leading a student too quickly from one stage to another. Lange saw the junior college as a school which could provide for the highest in adolescent growth. He constantly stated before professors, school superintendents, principals, teachers, and citizens that American secondary education began two years too late and ended two years too soon. Both the junior high school and junior college would make American secondary education better related to adolescence.

Like Jordan, Lange was highly critical of the quality of teaching in American universities for grades thirteen and fourteen. He noted that:

"No minute analysis of the present situation is required to reveal how the current overall emphasis on research and the training for research impairs the efficiency of the university. The

---

14

15

newly made Doctor of Philosophy is usually the last person to be entrusted with the carrying out of college aims. In this respect our imitation of Germany has not come far enough. In Germany the man-centered purposes of education remain from first to last in the hands of men of approved fitness. In the gymnasium it is the most experienced and most successful teachers that have charge of the work that corresponds to that of the freshman and sophomore years..."[16]

Lange emphasized improvement in the preparation of teachers so that they might become prepared for bringing about educational reform. Soon after his appointment as director of the Department of Education at Berkeley, he revised the scope of its objectives. The program for high school teachers was purposely set high, so there would be a supply of teachers prepared to teach junior college courses. In 1907 high school teachers needed a semester of graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree to be certified in California. Later this requirement was extended to one full year of graduate work. As a member of the California State board of Education, Lange had been partly responsible for the adoption of this state requirement. He believed that the secondary school teachers needed a solid academic background, as well as professional preparation. At Berkeley the five-year high school teacher program included a four-year liberal arts course with a concentrated professional preparation during the fifth year.[17]

Actually, Lange had advocated that junior college teachers be required to complete two years of graduate work. He postulated that "the work of junior college grades is beyond the qualifications of the rank and file of high school teachers." In addition the junior college teacher must not be inferior with respect to advanced scholarship to the university instructor.

The University of California under Lange's leadership prepared not only university professors and high school teachers but junior college instructors as well. He believed that the

---

16

17

mere possession of a doctoral degree with its emphasis on preparation of a future researcher was inadequate for junior college faculty members. Lange was rather clear on this when he remarked: "A mere specialist may do no great harm in a university; in a junior college with its man-centered aims, his ways would lead to destruction. Normally a Ph.D applying for a junior-college position should be asked to represent a certificate of rebirth. Ideally, he would possess], teaching power of a high order, demonstrated, not only in the course of professional training, but also in the secondary grades below those of the junior college. Whatever universities may continue to do, practice-teaching on junior college students is out of the question. Such power includes, not only ability to teach young men and women by an adequate use of instruction material, but also directive insight into the principles of secondary education and into the place and functions of the junior college as a part of the state school system. Of course no such standard can be applied at once."[18]

Lange proposed the requirement of a junior college certificate as a requirement for teaching in California junior colleges. Such a requirement would include graduate work in the teaching specialty as well as a series of courses related to the teaching - learning process. The professional courses Lange favored in the preparation of junior college instructors included History of Education, Educational Psychology and Directed and Supervised Teaching experience. Lange had become acquainted with John Dewey when they were active in the Herbartian Society and he used the following early works of Dewey in his classes at Berkeley; "Interest as Related to Will," My Pedagogic Creed, The School and Society and How We Think.[19] Lange expected that, as junior college teachers became better prepared by the university, an increasing number of junior college students would be able to transfer to Berkeley upon completion of the sophomore work. Like Jordan, at Stanford, Lange was fond of noting how well junior college transfers did at the university

---

18

19

during their junior and senior years. He attributed some of this success to superior junior college teaching when he stated:

"According to statistics recently gathered by recorder Sutton, of the state university, the scholarship average of those coming from junior colleges is several fractions higher than the general university average. There are good reasons why this should be so. Hitherto junior college classes have been small; they have been homogeneous and so have been able to start in on a higher level than is possible for the heterogeneous mass of university freshmen; they have been in charge not of the least experienced but of the most experienced teachers of their respective institutions; they have been less exposed to university side shows; they have come to their university life and work with great expectations, with freshness and enthusiasm."[20]

In summary, the California public junior college was advocated by its leaders, Jordan and Lange, not so much to elevate their universities, but to elevate undergraduate teaching. Universities might emphasize research at the expense of teaching. High schools might emphasize teaching at the expense of scholarship. The junior college might evolve as a hybrid institution with some of the university's concern for scholarship but with also the high school's emphasis on effective teaching. Lange seemed to envision the coming distinctive teaching role of the later day community junior college when he noted:

"Fortunately the universities, if they are to thrive as universities, need the junior colleges just as much as the junior colleges need articulation with universities...while the junior college will be influenced for the good of all concerned in the direction of adequate standards of scholarship, the universities, influenced in turn by the junior colleges; will recognize in the work of the freshman and sophomore years the continuation and culmination of secondary education will reshape themselves accordingly.

...At the University of California an interchange of instructors between junior colleges and the University has been sanctioned already, and I do not believe I am overtaxing my imagination when I think of the possibility of calling distinguished junior college teachers to college chairs at Berkeley..."[21]

The revisionist view that California junior colleges were established largely to elevate Stanford and the University of California fails to appreciate the genuine concerns Jordan and Lange had to protect and promote effective teaching in grades thirteen and fourteen. For Lange,

---

20

21

in particular, the junior college was envisioned to provide "for the best possible educational preparedness of the greatest number," and "with the junior high school in running order at one end and the junior colleges at the other, upper end, the cause for the criticism that for most American adolescents secondary education begins too late and ends too early and nowhere will have been removed."[22] The junior college was to be a distinctly American institution "unhampered as yet by tradition" and according to its chief advocate, Alexis Lange, able to "heel the challenge to do better things in better ways and to institutionalize modern insights into the relation of the school to social progress and into the purposes and methods of instruction and training during the whole period of adolescence."[23]

22

23

Notes

1. Gregory L. Goodwin, "The Nature and the Nurture of the Community College Movement," Community College Frontiers, Vol. 4, No. 3, (Spring 1976), 5-13.

2. Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, The Diverted Dream New York: Oxford University Press, 1989, 25 and 208.

3. L. S. Zwerling, Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), 303 Brint and Karabel, The Diverted Dream, 239,

4. Peter M. Blau, The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973, 104.

5. Quoted in Wall Street Journal, April 9, 1990, p. A 2. See also The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 18, 1990, A 13.

6. Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), 402-5.

7. David S. Jordan, "The Care and Culture of Freshmen," North American Review, CXCI (April, 1910), 441-42.

8. David S. Jordan, "The Junior College," Educational Review, XXXVII (May, 1909), 537-38.

9. Jordan to Caspar Hodgson, July 11, 1927 (in Jordan Papers, Stanford Collection, Stanford University).

10. David S. Jordan, The Days of a Man, Vol. I (New York: World Book Company, 1922), 84-85.

11. See Lange letter published in C. L. McLane, "The Junior College or Upward Extension of the High School." School Review XXI (March 1913), 167. See also David S. Jordan, "University Tendencies in America," Popular Science Monthly (June, 1903) 143-44.

12. Edwin C. Broome, A Historical and Critical Discussion of College Admission Requirement (New York 1902) 62, 101, 103.

13. David S. Jordan, Fourth Annual Report of the President of the University (Stanford, Calif.: Trustees Series Publications, 1907), 19.

14. David S. Jordan, "University Tendencies in America, 146-147. See also David S. Jordan, "American University Tendencies," University Chronicle, VI (April, 1903), 10.

15. Jordan Papers, Stanford Collection, Jordan to John B. Hemphill, June 6, 1927, 3.

16. Jordan Papers, Jordan to John B. Hemphill, 5 and Jordan to Morris J. Martin, March 2, 1925.

17. David Starr Jordan, "University-Building" Popular Science Monthly, LXI (August, 1902), 331-2.

18. Lange Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

19. California State High School Principals' Convention, March 31, 1920." Lange Papers.

20. Lawrence A. Cremins The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

21. Alexis Lange and Charles DeGarmo (eds.), Outlines of Educational Doctrine (New York: MacMillan Company, 1901).

22. Alexis Lange, "Our Adolescent School System," University Chronicle, X, No. 1 (January, 1908), 58-69.

23. Lange, The Lange Book, p. 160.

24. Alexis Lange, "Some Phases of University Efficiency" Reprint from University of California Chronicle, XIII, No.4, 9.

25. Evelyn A. Clement, "The Evolution of Teacher Training in California as a Phase of Social Change" (unpublished doctoral disertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1936). See also George Kyle, "Alexis Frederick Lange" Manuscript in University of California Archives.

26. Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College, With Special Reference to California" NEA Proceedings (Washington, D.C. 1915).

27. The Lange Book, 112-113.

28. Ibid, 233-4. See Edward A. Gallagher "Alexis Lange and the Origin of the Occupational Education Function in California Junior Colleges," Michigan Academician XXII (Summer 1990), 148-9. Former Professor George Kyte of the University of California was a student under Lange. He informed the writer that the Dewey works were used in his courses.

29. Lange Book, 115 and 116.

30. Ibid.

31. Lange Address, Sierra Educational News San Francisco, 1920, 16: 483-486.

32. Alexis Lange, "Junior College Department of Civic Education," School and Society, 1915, 2: 442-8.

egnotes

REFERENCES

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973

Bledstein, Burton J. The Culture of Professionalism New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1976.

Brint, Steven and Karabel, Jerome. The Diverted Dream. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Broome, Edwin C.
A Historical and Critical Discussion of College Admission Requirements, New York, 1902.

Chamberlain, Arthur, ed. The Lange Book.

Clement, Evelyn A. "The Evolution of Teacher Training in California as a Phase of Social Change" unpub. diss, University of California at Berkeley, 1936.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Gallagher, Edward A. "Alexis Lange and the Origin of the Occupatonal Education Functions in California Junior Colleges," Michigan Academician, XXII (Summer, 1990), 241-257.

Gallagher, Edward A. "Alexis Lange, Progressivism and Junior College Functions," Michigan Academician, VII (Summer, 1974), 111-122.

Gallagher, Edward A. "A Potent Bacillus at Ann Arbor: Origin of the Junior College Idea," Michigan Academician VI (Spring, 1974), 435-444.

Gallagher, Edward A. "From Tappan to Lange: Evolution of the Public Junior College Idea," Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1968.

Goodwin, Gregory L. "The Nature and the Nurture of the Community College Movement," Community College Frontiers, Vol. 4, No.3 (Spring 1976), 5-13.

Jordan, Davis S. "American Universities Tendencies," University Chronicle, VI (April, 1903).

Jordan, David S.
Fourth Annual Report of the President of the University. Stanford: Trustees Series Publications, 1907.

Jordan, David S.
The Call of the Nation A Plea For Taking Politics Out of Politics, Boston: American Unitarian Association.

Jordan, Davis S. "The Care and Culture of Freshmen," North American Review, CXCI (April, 1910), 441-42

Jordan, David S. "The Junior College," Educational Review, XXXVII (May, 1909) 537-38.

Jordan, David S. "University Building" Popular Science Monthly, LXI, August 1902, 330-338.

Jordan, David S. "University Tendencies in America," Popular Science Monthly (June, 1903) 143-144.

Jordan Papers Stanford Collection: Stanford University

Kyte, George. "Alexis Frederick Lange," Manuscript in University of California Archives.

Lange, Alexis. "Address," Sierra Educational News, Vol. 16, 1920. 483-86.

Lange, Alexis. "Junior College Department fo Civic Education," School and Society, Vol. 2, 1915, 442-8.

Lange, Alexis. "Our Adolescent School System," University Chronicle, X, No. 1 (January, 1908), 58-69.

Lange, Alexis. "Some Phases of University Efficiency," Reprint from University of California Chronicle, XIII, No.4.

Lange, Alexis. "The Junior College, with Special Reference to California," NEA Proceedings, Washington, D.C., 1915.

Lange, Alexis. The Lange Book, Ed. Arthur H. Chamberlain. San Francisco: Trade Publishing Company, 1927.

Lange Papers. Bancroft Library. University of California, Berkeley.

Lange, Alexis and DeGarmo, Charles (eds.). Outlines of Educational Doctrine. New York: MacMillan Company, 1901.

McLane, C. L. "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School," School Review, XXI March, 1913.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage, 1963.

Starr, Kevin. Americans and the California Dream, 1850-1915. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Tyack, David. The One Best System, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Veysey, Lawrence. The Emergence of the American University, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Zwerling, L. S. Second Best: The Crisis of the community College, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.